

COMMON AGENDA
TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2003
Immediately Following the 7:30 a.m.
Joint LPS/City/County Meeting
NORTH STAR HIGH SCHOOL
(5801 North 33rd Street)

I. MINUTES

- A. Minutes of Common Meeting of March 4, 2003

II. PRESENTATIONS

- A. Planning - Briefing on Comp Plan Annual Review - 30 Minutes
- B. PBC (Don Killeen) - Parking Garages - 30 Minutes
- C. PW /Planning - Discussion on West Superior Street (west of NW 54th Street) - 30 Minutes

III ADJOURNMENT

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

COMMON MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 13th, 2003-(Approximately 8:30a.m.)

North Star High School - 5801 North 33rd Street
Lincoln, Nebraska

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ken Svoboda, Common Chair, Jon Camp; Jonathan Cook; Glenn Friendt; Coleen Seng; Terry Werner; ***COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:*** Annette McRoy; ***MAYOR WESELY:*** Not in Attendance.

COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ray Stevens, Common Vice-Chair; Bernie Heier; Larry Hudkins; Deb Schorr; Bob Workman; ***COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:*** None

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Allan Abbott, Public Works Director; Don Killeen, Public Building Commission; Marvin Krout, Planning Director; City and County Staff Members; Media Representatives; Development Representatives, Mr. Rich Wiese, Other Citizens and Constituents

1. MINUTES

(1) Common Meeting of Monday, March 4, 2003

Chair Ken Svoboda opened the meeting and called for approval of the above-listed minutes. Jon Camp moved approval of the minutes, as presented. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous consensus.

THIS MEETING WAS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS:

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION (PBC) - PARKING GARAGES

BRIEFING ON COMP PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW

DISCUSSION ON WEST SUPERIOR STREET (WEST OF NW 54TH STREET)

PBC - PARKING GARAGES - Mr. Svoboda asked if the Common Members would approve an Agenda change to allow Mr. Killeen to make his presentation before the first listed Agenda item. The Common Members agreed.

Mr. Killeen came forward and reported on and gave a brief review of the attached material [Attachment A]. He stated that the Public Building Commission's intent was that whatever parking costs were implemented, they be consistent for both the County and City employees. He noted that the purple and green tags would be issued at \$30.00 per month. This would cover parking in the lower level of the new parking facility, under the County-Building, under the Correctional facility and in the West Lot. The South Lot would have no charges applied due to the possibility of having the issue injected into union negotiations. There are approximately 840 parking tags issued. That doesn't necessarily fill the needs for all employees, obviously. It was noted that elected officials are not included in the proposed cost structure because it was felt, as is the policy with the State, that they should not be charged for parking while in the process of conducting community business.

Mr. Hudkins asked about the provisions for public parking. It was explained that there would be some room allotted for the public to utilize while conducting government business by having the parking ticket permits validated in the offices where their business is conducted. That would allow the public the use of the facility even if not conducting government business, but they would be paying and paying at a higher rate than those actually conducting business at the County/City Building. This system would also allow the tracking of which departments are actually serving the greatest number of citizens.

Mr. Camp noted that there had been a couple of motivations when the PBC Parking Sub-Committee had formed the parking policies. One was to encourage other modes of transportation, encouraging the use by employees of the Public Transportation System. Another motivation had been in conjunction with the negotiated contracts with the employees - this could be a bargaining chip. The third issue had been to have a coordinated approach with the City and County so that there is equity to all employees on both sides.

He added that he would like to see the encouragement of participation by employees in the payment of departmental parking allotments. These facilities will need to be maintained, so, as we look at re-negotiating employee contracts, we can consider ways of having employees paying some of that maintenance cost.

The Common Members asked further questions regarding the details of the parking program which Mr. Killeen answered. Mr. Stevens stated that he did not believe that following the State's program would necessarily be a good idea. He felt the elected officials should not be exempt from whatever charges are applied to the rest of the employees. He thought the elected officials should pay for that convenience, if they are so inclined to use it.

Mr. Svoboda asked if Council Members, who, (as Mr. Cook noted), don't make quite the same salary as the County Commissioners, could use their discretionary funds for parking fees. Mr. Svoboda agreed with Mr. Stevens, stating that it was a valid point - that public perception is a key to a lot of these things.

Discussion continued with Mr. Killeen answering further questions regarding details of the proposed parking policies noting that the processing would be on a computer-based program that would allow great flexibility and reliability of the system. He stated that they had planned for expansion in the new parking facility that would allow growth as the need arose.

BRIEFING ON COMP PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW - Mr. Marvin Krout, Planning Director, came forward and made remarks explaining the recent history of the Comp Plan process. He noted that the Plan has 132 recommendations for actions for new studies that need to be launched and initiated in order to implement all of the recommendations. He stated that about half of those study projects are already under way.

One of the recommendations calls for an annual review of the progress being made. There are nineteen proposals to amend the Comprehensive Plan which came from a number of private and public parties, including the County Board. Mr. Krout commented that this year is the first year that the Capital Improvement Programs of the City have been tied into the Comprehensive Plan, not only by regulations, but by policy. This will allow review of both the financial aspect and the developmental aspects of our community's growth. Mr. Krout introduced Steve Henrichsen who reviewed the nineteen amendments. (See Attachment B).

The Denial of Amendment 8 was initiated by several additional questions that came up regarding 'no build' in the flood plain, the road network and the impact on Havelock and 48th 84th Street in terms of median opening and on that particular 10-acre site as it relates to the over-all parking plan for the Ag Center. These concerns led to a recommendation to not approve the amendment at this time. Mr. Hudkins noted that one of the reasons the Ag Society had chosen that site was that the Commercial area on the corner would have some type of housing and restaurant facilities there. He asked if they had been given alternatives so that they could develop the site? Mr. Henrichsen answered that they had met with Public Works to discuss some of the transportation issues and the flood plain build items. Those discussions are on-going.

The Deferral of Amendment 9 was recommended, even though Hickman's proposals fit into the City's Comp Plan, to allow further discussion and review by the County Board, which would be the body that had jurisdiction on this issue. The extension of Hickman's one-mile zone was a consideration which had been denied in last years Comp Plan proposal.

Amendments 10-19 were brought forward by private parties. The Denial of Amendments 12-13 regarding Highway 2 development was recommended because the traffic impact would not be in conformance with the Lincoln Southeast Sub-area Plan.

The Deferral of Amendment 16 was to allow a review of current information after it was learned that the area is not a saline wetland.

Denial of Amendment 17 was based on a need to further investigate the extent of impact on our public transit system and to determine where a Personal Rapid Transit corridor could be appropriately applied.

The Schedule for Review of Comp Plan Recommendations from the Planning Commission - The Planning Commission would be holding a meeting on May 21st. The earliest date for a public hearing on their recommendations would be June 30th. There would be another Common Meeting scheduled for June 2nd where things could be discussed in more detail. Tuesday, July 1st might also be a time to consider for a joint public hearing on the items. Common Budget hearings are scheduled for July 8th from 4:00 - 8:00 p.m. The July 4th Holiday would be something to be considered when setting up the schedule.

With this information, discussion ensued as to the most appropriate schedule for the joint meetings for public hearing on the Planning Commission's Recommendations for the Comp Plan. [Other concerns such as CIP incorporation and funding for the proposed projects were also discussed briefly].

A decision for a final date for the Joint Public Hearing on the Comp Plan Amendment Recommendations was that it be set for some 'yet to be determined' date in July.

DISCUSSION ON WEST SUPERIOR STREET (WEST OF NW 54TH STREET) Mr. Allan Abbott came forward to ask if the County Board would clarify their request for an alternate study for a Wildrose Lane re-location. He wondered if this alternate study was instead of, in lieu of or in addition to the last Wildrose Lane Study. Mr. Hudkins stated that the County Board had a number of people come before them to ask that Wildrose Lane not be closed. If it was felt that the closure was necessary, it would be less of an impact on the schools and the fire districts if the alternate went to the north. The railroads also said that with the new switching operations there, they'd like to have the crossing as far north as possible to allow them adequate area. We did see a study by Schemmer, but that was a study for an overpass on the extension of Fletcher and we did not see a study of a proposal north of Highway 34, which would interchange at a right angle and would not be taking traffic across lanes.

Mr. Abbott answered that what you would be doing would be *instead* of Wildrose. Mr. Hudkins stated that this was the alternative that the local people thought would be most acceptable. Mr. Abbott stated that the Wildrose Lane proposal had come from the County Engineer as the initial proposal. He stated that they had been working with the County Engineer on the location site. It was the County Engineers decision/recommendation to abandon Wildrose Lane. Secondly, Mr Abbott noted, they would be meeting with the railroad today to further clarify whether or not a crossing at Fletcher would be a problem for the railroad. The third point, which he felt was most important, is that the City cannot continue our commitment to Kawasaki until this issue has been decided. We've committed to Kawasaki to build the road from Highway 34 over to their parking lot on the south side - not extending Fletcher there. We cannot let that contract until this issue is resolved.

The design we've got shows a round-about at the location of Fletcher and 27th Street. If we go with the alternate that the County Board has asked us to look at, we won't need the round-about. It will be a completely different design cutting up through some more of Kawasaki's property. Also, an intersection north of there will cause more problems with traffic. He noted that the Public Works Department would look at this and brief the County Board, but this is going to be a very critical decision on whether or not we can continue to meet our obligation to Kawasaki for access to their parking lot from the south. He noted that there are many ramifications in the decision over and above the concerns of a few individuals having to go a little bit out of their way, including serving Kawasaki, providing the safe operation of an intersection, and the fact that this would be the 24th study on this issue. This needs to be decided upon now.

Mr. Hudkins commented that there was no problem with Public Works completing Fletcher. He did fail to see the reason why a decision would have to be made at this point and not leave it in the Comprehensive Plan as we all agreed to last year, because 90% of the problem in that area has been eliminated with the opening of the ramps to Highway 34. Only 10% of the traffic goes west - even if you do open Fletcher.

Mr. Workman noted that he had a problem Mr. Hudkins use of the term "we", which would indicate concurrence by the entire Board with Mr. Hudkins' statements. Mr. Workman noted that he was not dogmatic with any decision he had made in the past. He added that he had a little bit of a problem with the letter the County Board had sent out in that it seems to paint a picture of one point of view...and there is more to the story than what is portrayed in that letter. His question, from a study standpoint, was by moving that road south, would there be a problem with traffic being backed up because of a possible switching yard. He understood that there would be a meeting with the railroad tomorrow. He was concerned that we are delaying a situation that might impinge on Kawasaki. He thought it was very important that those issues be addressed with this company. They are going to have 3-5,000 employees out there in a few years. There is a last minute proposal to put another road going west farther north - maybe that's a good idea - maybe not. He felt, looking at the maps, (perhaps not from an engineering standpoint, but from a practical standpoint),

that it is not a bad idea to put the road down there. He stated that he was open to debate and would be interested in any information obtained from the railroad tomorrow. He didn't want to be painted into a corner by that letter.

Mr. Abbott stated that we must make a decision because the connection to Kawasaki's entrance on the south side will determine the issue of the extension of Fletcher Road. It was asked that a County representative be allowed to attend the scheduled meeting with the railroad. Mr. Abbott stated that he would get the information to the Board so that Mr. Hudkins could attend.

After this exchange, Staff gave a brief over-view of the portion of Superior Street between NW 48th & NW 70th Streets. Background on the area [See Attachment C] shows that it was originally platted in 1942 by the U.S. Government. They asked at that time that one lot the length of Superior Street be vacated. It was approved that way at the time and basically, since that time, there has not been any right-of-way through that connects Superior on the west and on the east. A number of letters in the files show that over the years, there have been requests to create that connection, beginning in 1972. At that time, we said "no". Part of the area that was right-of-way is currently under private ownership now. Part of it is owned by the Lincoln Housing Authority. In order to get that back, we'd have to purchase that right-of-way.

A concern we have with taking this through is that if we were to create a Superior Street arterial, we'd be running that arterial traffic down a street that has a number of homes on both sides [Residential]. It would create some real traffic problems.

One of the other problems we have with pushing Superior through as it now exists is that it does not line up with what would be Superior on the east side of the road. Another irregularity when it was platted was that they turned the street off of the section line, so it does create some problems. In the last Comprehensive Plan what we did was recognize the fact that this is not a good connection. But, at some point, the area probably will develop and we will need to have access to those areas. What we looked at were potential ways of getting the access through the area. As a result of that realization, we need to further study that issue. One of the things we have considered was possibly bringing it up along the back side to Cuming Street and tying in there. But this is a question for future study and we need to look at it for best results.

Mr. Hudkins asked if it made more sense to go to Cuming or Stanton? He noted that there were two streets that aren't built up on at this time. The response was that it wasn't known if it made a difference. Again - that's why we need to do the study to see what the effects would be. Mr. Hudkins noted that long-term that is probably the best answer. The short term is that we have nearly 300 cars per day going up to the new Strength Center, eighty acres of ground which the University has purchased at West Superior and the confluence of NW 70th Street. We also have individual homes that have been there which are really on a dirt road at this point. Mr. Hudkins asked what the suggestion for serving that area might be? We've waited and studied for a number of years and residents don't even have a surfaced road to get to their residences, let alone if fire or rescue units had to respond in the area. What is the practical thing to do to get that road open and get a surface on there, even if it is with temporary pressed rock?

The question of access for local residents was discussed. It was noted that the need for such access should be addressed. Mr. Svoboda stated that he would like to have all options explored and start putting some dollar amounts on those options so we can begin looking at how to provide access to property owners whose residences are up there - not to mention other property owners up and down Superior Street. He noted that we certainly do not want to look at West Superior Street as an arterial all the way to NW 48th Street, but he would like to explore a quick time-line on a solution.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - The next Common Meeting schedule was left open though June 2nd, 8:30 a.m. was the scheduled date. *[Final date was set for June 2nd, 2003 at 8:30 a.m. - at the Health Department].*

ADJOURNMENT - Mr. Svoboda called for adjournment. The motion was made and seconded and the meeting was declared adjourned by unanimous consensus at approximately 10:10 a.m.

*Submitted by
Joan V. Ray
Council Secretary*